

# Interview Summary

Application No.

09/745,751

Applicant(s)

HOCHMAN, MARK N.

Examiner

Michael J Hayes

Art Unit

3763

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Michael J Hayes.

(3) Mark Hochman.

(2) Ted Weisz.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 01 April 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☒ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: needle holder device to demonstrate needle deflection.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 7

Identification of prior art discussed: Brown, Garnier

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant stated he felt claims distinguished over Brown & Garnier b/c prior art did not show translation and rotation simultaneously. Applicant stated that Garnier goes through bone, not soft tissue.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Michael J Hayes  
Examiner's signature, if required